

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in view of the above Amendment and the discussion below.

Applicants invention and the defining features over the prior art reference to Milne et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,983,087) are contained at pages 5-8 of the Amendment filed on July 9, 2004, which is incorporated herein by reference with the following comments being made in light of the present rejection which contains rejections based upon a new combination of references, but with the primary reference to Milne et al. still being used as a basis for the rejection.

In the "Response to Arguments" section at page 5 of the patent Office Action dated December 14, 2004, the Examiner indicates that Applicants arguments with respect to Milne et al. for failing to disclose the automobile having two different operating voltages for the different amplifiers were not persuasive because "the claim does not limit the voltage of the amplifiers to the voltage of the automobile, merely indicates that one is higher than the other" concluding that it is well known for low frequencies to require a stronger drive than high frequency signals. It was also indicated that the claim language is interpreted to its broadest interpretation and that two different power sources were not claimed.

Therefore, the rejection based on the reference Milne et al. was still maintained and the secondary references were provided to support amplifiers functioning at different capacities for low and high frequencies.

In response to this indication and the rejection of independent claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Milne and claims 5 and 6 including independent claim 5 over the combination over Milne and House (U.S. Patent No.: 4,809,338), Applicants have amended each of independent claims 3 and 5 to specifically recite that the motor vehicle system is for a vehicle operated by an electrical system providing a first voltage and that the audio system includes at

least one amplifier supplied by said first voltage. Additionally, the separate amplifier is recited as having a significantly higher operating voltage than the first voltage supplied to the other amplifier, which is the electrical system operating voltage. Each of claims 1 and 5 contain these limitations and have been specifically modified to comply with the Examiner's indication that the claim language does not limit the voltage of the amplifiers to the voltage of the automobile as indicated at page 5, item 5 of the patent Office Action.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 3 and 5 now provide structure not shown or disclosed or made obvious by the reference to Milne either alone or in combination with any of the secondary references to House or Kaplan and that claim 7 defines over the same references as it contains the limitations of independent claim 5.


Therefore, in view of the compliance with the requirements of the Examiner for specifically stating that the voltage of the amplifiers is the voltage of the automobile and that the secondary amplifier has a different voltage from that of the "automobile voltage", Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #080437.49898US).

Respectfully submitted,

April 14, 2005

  
For Jeffrey D. Sanok

Registration No. 32,169

**VINCENT J. SUNDERDICK**  
**Registration No. 29,004**

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JDS:VJS:ddd

#371003